

Remarks

In response to the Office Action mailed on September 28, 2010, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks. In the present application, claims 1 and 50-52 have been amended for clarification. Support for the amended claims may be found at least on page 13, lines 26-30 in the Specification. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 43-47, 49-52, 60, 62, 63 and 65-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Hofmann et al. (US 7,328,216, hereinafter “Hofmann”). Claims 61 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hofmann.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 43-47, 49-52, 60, 62, 63 and 65-67 are rejected as being as being allegedly anticipated by Hofmann. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, “wherein dynamically matching the user input pattern comprises comparing a partial user input, as a current user input comprising the partial user input is being generated by the current user, with one of the user input pattern profiles contained in the database.” Amended independent claims 50-52 recite similar features.

Hofmann discusses the personalized filtering of information and the automated generation of user-specific recommendations. User data may be gathered explicitly through questionnaires, etc. or can be implied through observing user behavior such as Internet history logs, demographic information, or any other relevant sources of information. Document data can be gathered through a variety of methods including Internet crawling, topic taxonomies or any

other relevant source of information. User profiles are processed through a profiler module to provide the user related information, such as transaction data, click stream data, download, demographic information, etc. A collaborative filtering module performs two functions: 1) it analyzes the current user's historical profile; and 2) it analyzes other users' historical profiles. Preferably both profile analyses are used in combination with the learned semantic associations and computed probabilities to provide improved predictions or recommendations lists. A server platform provides intelligent retrieval of information and incorporates user information from a user profile and from collaborative filtering into the search. From these functions, personalized search results, automatic categorization of documents, email and text sorting and recommendations can be provided. (See col. 2, lines 32-38 and col. 17, lines 5-56).

Hofmann fails to teach comparing a partial user input, as a current user input comprising the partial user input is being generated by the current user, with user input pattern profiles as recited by amended claim 1. In contrast, Hofmann merely discusses user and document data gathering through questionnaires, Internet history logs, demographic information, Internet crawling, and topic taxonomies. Then, a collaborative filtering module may be utilized to analyze the current user's historical profile and other users' historical profiles. Hofmann however, fails to teach or disclose comparing, during the generation of a current user input, a part (i.e., a partial input) of the currently generated user input with user input pattern profiles. In particular, Hofmann is silent with respect to the utilization of partial user inputs generated during a current user input for user input pattern profile matching. Moreover, Hofmann discusses the gathering of historical data (e.g., Internet history logs and a current user's historical profile) instead of the utilization of current data (i.e., a current user input) for collaborative filtering.

Hofmann would not have led to the claimed invention because these references fail to at least teach “wherein dynamically matching the user input pattern comprises comparing a partial user input, as a current user input comprising the partial user input is being generated by the current user, with one of the user input pattern profiles contained in the database.” Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 50-52 patentably distinguish the claimed invention over the cited reference, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the current rejection of these claims. Dependent claims 43-47, 49, 60, 62, 63 and 65-67 also patentably distinguish the claimed invention over Hofmann at least for the reasons described above regarding amended independent claims 1 and 52 by virtue of their dependencies upon the aforementioned claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the current rejection of these dependent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 61 and 64 are rejected as being as being allegedly unpatentable over Welsh in view of Hofmann. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Dependent claims 61 and 64 depend from amended independent claim 52 and thus recite at least the same features. As discussed above, amended independent claim 52 patentably distinguishes the claimed invention over Hofmann because Hofmann fails to teach or disclose at least “wherein dynamically matching the user input pattern comprises comparing a partial user input, as a current user input comprising the partial user input is being generated by the current user, with one of the user input pattern profiles contained in the database.” Accordingly, dependent claims 61 and 64 also patentably distinguish the claimed invention over Hofmann for at least the same reasons. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the current rejection of these claims.

Conclusion

The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. Thus, the claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention embodiments, as amended, are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicants therefore request the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD, P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-9946
(404) 954-5064

Date: January 18, 2011

/Alton Hornsby III/
Alton Hornsby III
Reg. No. 47,299

AH:sem